Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/035,921	KUMAR ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
John Van Bramer	3622	

	John van Bramer	3022	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>20 June 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP	LICATION IN CONDITION FOR A	LLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, wwith 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	date of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire Is Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE).	g date of the final rejection FIRST REPLY WAS FII	on. LED WITHIN TWO
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount hortened statutory period for reply origi	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on . A brief in comp	liance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be	filed within two months	s of the date of
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi AMENDMENTS			e appeal. Since a
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b	out prior to the date of filing a brief,	will not be entered be	cause
(a) They raise new issues that would require further cor	•	ΓE below);	
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	•		
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in beti	er form for appeal by materially rec	ducing or simplifying ti	ne issues for
appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c	corresponding number of finally reje	acted claims	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	one openating frame or or finally reju	ottod olaimio.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21 See attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment (PTOI -324)
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		mphane / monamone (1 1 0 2 0 2 1 //
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all		timely filed amendmer	nt canceling the
non-allowable claim(s).	,		
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		l be entered and an e	xplanation of
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attach	ed.
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	I NOT I II II II II II	190 6 11	
 The request for reconsideration has been considered but <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> 		i condition for allowan	ce because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (13. ☐ Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
/Eric W. Stamber/			
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3622			

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: No amendments were proposed. The applicants arguments have been fully considered bu to not place the application in condition for allowance. The applicants contention that the examiner did not address the arguments made in the last rejection regarding independent claim 1. The examiner disagrees. A the applicant admits, the arguments directed to the newly proposed amendents in claim 1 were address by additional citations of the Hite reference in the rejection itself. As the applicant recites in the specification Playback rules include aspects selected from the group consisting of geographic location, demographics, media playback history, time of day, date, day of week, month of year, and season of year. As disclosed in the cited refrence of HIte, the CID codes are sent to individually addressable digital recording devices with unique addresses that are installed at the display site (Col 5, line 28 through Col 6, line 39. Hite further discloses that attached to each commercial are codes indicating conditions and rules required to display the commercial. These rules include date, day-part, network, program context, etc. (Col 6, line 60 through Col 7, line 34. Thus playback rules are disclosed as required by the limitations of the claims as currently written. The applicants arguments directed towards the effect of the preamble are unconvincing. The claim clearly recites a media and advertiseement player. If there was intended to be a plurality of media and advertisement players such a recitation is required. If the applicant is truly having difficulty finding a reference in the mpep directed towards the requirement that the metes and bounds of the claim must be specifically and distinctly set forth in the claims, the examiner directs them to MPEP 2173.05. The applicants argument that Hite does not adjust playback rules is incorrect. Hite specifically discloses adjusting playback rules in Col 8, lines 18-39 as cited in the rejecti

2